

Sri F. H. MOHSIN.—Sir, the Hon'ble Minister is not referring to the rehabilitating question. The Bill seeks only to shift the people. Our suggestion all along was that slum clearance would not be successful unless the slum dwellers were rehabilitated. In fact the Planning Commission have stressed that the very essence of the scheme was that. But here the Hon'ble Minister has not stated anything about the rehabilitation scheme.

Sri T. SUBRAMANYA.—We are rehabilitating so far as accommodation is concerned. If rehabilitation includes employment also, I am sorry we cannot undertake that under this scheme or any of the provisions of Municipal laws. There are separate laws for that purpose. They will be enforced. So far as rehabilitation with regard to accommodation is concerned, we will either give them alternate sites or ready-made platforms or we will give them separate dwelling places before we order eviction. With these observations, I commend this Bill for the consideration of the House.

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU (Cubbonpet).—What are the steps that Government propose to take to prevent the growth of slums in the neighbourhood? For instance, slum clearance may start in one place, but in an adjacent area it may grow up. How do you prevent the growth of slums simultaneously as you take up the clearance of slums?

Sri T. SUBRAMANYA.—We have authorised the Deputy Commissioners to enforce the provisions of the Land Revenue Code and under the rules framed and to see that no constructions are put up unauthorisedly on any of the revenue lands. My friend also knows that we have recently ordered the pulling down of certain hutments put up in the neighbourhood of the Corporation area. We are enforcing the law to prevent further growth of the slums.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

“That the Mysore Slum Areas (Improvement and Clearance) Bill, 1958, be taken into consideration.”

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Bill will be put clause by clause. There are some amendments moved by Sri Narasimhan. He is not here. I will therefore put all the clauses.

The question is:

“That Clauses 2 to 40, both inclusive and the first schedule and the second schedule stand part of the Bill.”

The motion was adopted.

Clauses 2 to 40, both inclusive and the first and the second schedules were added to the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

“That Clause 1, the Title and the Preamble stand part of the Bill.”

The motion was adopted.

Clause 1 the Title and the Preamble were added to the Bill.

Motion to pass

Sri T. SUBRAMANYA.—Sir, I move:

“That the Mysore Slum Areas (Improvement and Clearance) Bill, 1958, be passed.”

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

“That the Mysore Slum Areas (Improvement and Clearance) Bill, 1958, be passed.”

The motion was adopted.

MADRAS CULTIVATING TENANTS PROTECTION (MYSORE AMENDMENT) BILL, 1958.

Motion to consider.

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA (Minister for Revenue).—Sir, I beg to move:

“That the Madras Cultivating Tenants Protection (Mysore Amendment) Bill, 1958, be taken into consideration.”

Mr. SPEAKER.—Motion moved:

“That the Madras Cultivating Tenants Protection (Mysore Amendment) Bill, 1958, be taken into consideration.”

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—Sir, it is a very simple measure. In South Kanara District and Kollegal Taluk, there is an enactment in force . . .

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA (Palaiyam).—Not in South Kanara.

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—I am definite about it. This enactment is known as the Madras Cultivating Tenants Protection Act of 1955. This enactment gives certain privileges to the tenants. This enactment was due to expire on the 26th September 1958. The Legislature was not in session and therefore an Ordinance was promulgated. The Bill before us now seeks to replace that Ordinance. The main object of this Bill is to extend the term of this Act for an indefinite period so that the ryots may enjoy the privileges that are conferred upon them under this Act. I commend the Bill for the acceptance of the House.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—Sir, the Government ought to have taken steps even before the period expired and brought up this Bill. In the last session I invited the attention of the then Revenue Minister to the need of bringing up a comprehensive legislation to protect the tenants in those areas. If only they had opened their eyes at that time, they would not have had recourse to issuing an Ordinance.

Sri K. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO (Mysore city).—Has hardship been caused there ?

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—If they had brought forward a Bill even in the last session, they would not have taken recourse to the issuing of an Ordinance. That is my first point. My second submission is that as the Hon'ble Minister pointed out, it seeks to extend for an indefinite period.

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—Until it is repealed.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—Also, they have proposed to omit section 5 of the principal Act. As the original Act stood, it sought to prohibit any execution of a decree or order for eviction. That was the intention of the original Act. Since it is omitted, I do not understand the view of the Government whether they mean to nullify the orders passed or keep them in abeyance. I have

nothing more to add except to say that we would have appreciated if the Bill had been brought in the last session itself.

11 A.M.

*Sri V. SRINIVAS SHETTY (Coondapur).—With regard to the observation that this is beneficial to the tenant, we see Sir, that in practice there is practically no benefit to the tenants at all in these series of Acts. It is a reminder at best to the landlords—a continuous reminder to the landlords of the things to come that unless they take steps immediately and urgently, things will not be better.

Year in and year out, we have been hearing that we are passing legislation for the benefit of the tenants and the landlords taking fullest advantage of this legislation forcibly evict the tenants. This has become a farce. In my own district, the Hon'ble Minister was pleased to say that this legislation was beneficial to my district—it is possible that he may have in mind South Kanara and Kollegal. But I would say that these enactments have brought more harm to the relationship between the landlords and tenants. Unless the Government is able to introduce land reforms in order to help the agriculturist and take immediate steps, this haphazard legislation and lip sympathy towards the tenant is not good at all. But we are hearing promises. We are getting sympathies by instalments. It was all right once. But Now, I must say that these sympathies by instalments are most harassing. I hope Sir, that all these things will not end with sympathies only. We have been hearing in every session, and in this session also that even before the end of the session something concrete will be done. We are completely sick of you and your sympathies.

Sir, I do not know if there is any mistake or whether I am making a mistake or whether the Hon'ble Minister is mistaken. In the extracts of clause it is said as follows :

“(1) This Act may be called the Madras Cultivating Tenants Protection Act, 1955.

(SRI V. SRINIVAS SHETTY)

(2) It extends to the whole of the Madras Area except

(i) the district of South Kanara."

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—There is a further amendment in 1956 extending it to South Kanara.

Sri V. SRINIVAS SHETTY.—The preamble to the Bill says:

"Whereas it is expedient further to amend the Madras Cultivating Tenants Protection Act, 1955 (Madras Act, XXV of 1955), as in force in the Madras Area; "

It is not said "as amended".

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—It says "as in force."

Sri V. SRINIVAS SHETTY.—I personally would have completely opposed the Bill, because it is a farce. It has been going far too long and unless the Government is serious enough to bring in proper legislation, this will not help anybody. I oppose this Bill, Sir.

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—Sir, I beg to submit that the contention of my Hon'ble friend Sri Srinivas Shetty that this Bill has caused more harm than good is an incorrect statement. I know the conditions obtaining in South Kanara. The majority of the tenants have been benefited on account of this measure. No doubt here and there landlords might have been able to evade these enactments. Some landlords might have managed to resume their lands. But that happens in every place all over the State, not only in South Kanara.

With regard to my friend Sri Venkatai Gowda's contention that there are two reasons for deleting the section 5, I submit that his contention is not correct. There is no necessity for this section in view of the fact that this enactment will continue indefinitely until it is repealed.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—Till then, It could have been kept in abeyance.

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—Not necessary; because the duration is not fixed, it continues indefinitely.

Therefore, I commend this measure for the approval of this Hon'ble House.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

"That the Madras Cultivating Tenants Protection (Mysore Amendment) Bill, 1958 be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—As there are no amendments, I will put all the clauses. The question is:

"That Clauses 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 and the Title and the Preamble stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clauses 1 to 5 and the Title and Preamble were added to the Bill.

Motion to pass.

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—Sir, I beg to move:

"That the Madras Cultivating Tenants Protection (Mysore Amendment) Bill, 1958 be passed."

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

"That the Madras Cultivating Tenants Protection (Mysore Amendment) Bill, 1958 be passed."

The motion was adopted.

MADRAS AREA MUNICIPALITIES (EXTENSION OF TERM OF COUNCILLORS) BILL, 1958.

Sri T. SUBRAMANYA (Minister for Law, Labour and Local Self-Government).—Sir, I move:

"That the Madras Area Municipalities (Extension of Term of Councillors) Bill, 1958 be taken into consideration."

Mr. SPEAKER.—Motion moved:

"That the Madras Areas Municipalities (Extension of Term of Councillors) Bill, 1958 be taken into consideration."

* Sri T. SUBRAMANYA.—Sir, in Mangalore and Udipi elections ought to